NUMBER	PRD-03
--------	--------

PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

		_2004	For Calendar Year:
	Continuing		
Г	New		

Previous Year (below line/defer)

Issue: Exploration of Youth Rates for Recreation Programs and Activities

Lead Department: Parks and Recreation

General Plan Element or Sub-Element: Recreation Sub-Element

1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?

This Study Issue was precipitated during Council's initial study of fees for public use of the newly developed 50-meter pool at Fremont Union High School. For a number of reasons, staff recommended against youth rates and Council supported that initial recommendation. This Study Issue is proposed by Councilmember Risch in acknowledgement of continued public interest in reduced youth rates for Fremont Pool. However, Councilmember Risch also believes that if youth rates are to be further studied for Fremont Pool, they should be studied in the context of youth rates for all other City recreational programs and activities.

Key elements of the issue would be:

- defining "youth rates"
- a review of Departmental philosophies and policies regarding the establishment of fees, and youth rates in particular
- the critical role fees play in the context of the City's enterprise funds and the Community Recreation Fund in particular
- a review of existing youth rates associated with City recreational programs
- a review of Fremont Pool and youth rates in the context of all of the above
- a review of possible impacts to the Community Recreation Fund and General Fund should changes in staff's current approach to youth rates be made

2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?

Policy C.3. – Utilize available pricing and promotional tools in order to maximize participation and/or use related programs, facilities and services, without jeopardizing the integrity and infrastructure of related facilities.

3.

4.

5.

Origin of issue:							
Councilmember: Risc	:h						
General Plan:							
Staff:				*			
BOARD or COMMISSION							
Arts		Housir	ng & Huma	ın Sv	cs		
Bldg. Code of Appeals		Library	/				
BPAC		Parks	& Rec.				
CCAB		Persor	nnel				
Heritage & Preservation		Planni	ng				
Parks & Recreation Comm	ission	ranked	Defer*	of		· 	
Arts Commission		ranked	3	of	4		
Board / Commission Rank The Parks and Recreation C study until after calendar yea	Commiss	ion recomme	nded defer	ral of	this i	ssue for	•
The Arts Commission ranke consideration for study in ca			of 3 issues	rank	ced fo	r Counc	:il
City Council recommended 2003.	deferral	of this issue f	or study un	ıtil aft	er cal	endar y	ear
*The Parks and Recreation study until after calendar year		sion recomm	ended defe	rral c	of this	issue fo	r
The Arts Commission ranke Sub-Element) out of 4 issue year 2004.		•		•	•		
Due date for Continuing is	sues (if	known):					
	/	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Multiple Year Project? Ye	es 🗌 N	lo 🛛 Expec	ted Year o	f Co	mplet	tion 20	04

6.	Estimated work hours for com	pletion	of the study issue.		
	(a) Estimated work hours from the lead department				30
	(b) Estimated work hours from consultant(s):			0	
	(c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office:				0
	(d) List any other department(s hours:	s) and ni	ımber of work		
	Department(s): n/a				0
	Total Estimated Hours:				30
7.	Expected participation involve	d in the	study issue proces	s?	
	(a) Does Council need to appro	ove a wo	ork plan?	Yes 🗌	No 🖂
	(b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission?				No 🗔
	If so, which Board/Commission? Parks & Recreation Commission Arts Commission				
	(c) Is a Council Study Session anticipated?			Yes $oxtimes$	No 🗌
	(d) What is the public participation process?				
	The public would have opposed hearings of the Parks and City Council. In addition, the Study Session.	Recreation	on Commission, Arts	Commissio	n and
8.	Estimated Fiscal Impact:				
	Cost of Study	\$	0		
	Capital Budget Costs	\$	0		
	New Annual Operating Costs	\$ deter	mined by study		
*	New Revenues or Savings \$ determined by study				
	10 Year RAP Total	\$	0		
9.	Staff Recommendation				
	Recommended	d for Stu	dy		
	☐ Against Study				
		dation			

Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.

reviewed by	Odober 8 2003
Department Director	Date
approved by Salala	10-8-03
City Manager	Date